1. Summary of the Office Action

In the office action mailed August 27, 2007, the Examiner stated that claims 1-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being allegedly indefinite, but the Examiner discussed only claim 1 in this regard. Further, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10, 14-21, and 25-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,771,644 (Brassil) or U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2003/0107994 (Jacob) in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2003/0231634 (Henderson).

The Examiner further objected to claims 11-13 and 22-24 as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but the Examiner indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

2. Status of the Specification

Applicant has amended the specification to correct typographical errors, where the term "RTCP" had been erroneously typed as "RTPC". No new matter has been added.

3. Status of the Claims

Applicant has cancelled claims 11, 15-18, 22, and 26-31, and Applicant has amended claims 1, 12, 13, 23, and 24. Now pending are claims 1-10, 12-14, 19-21, and 23-25, of which claims 1 and 19 are independent and the remainder are dependent.

4. Response to Rejections

a. Response to § 112 Rejections

As noted above, the Examiner stated that claims 1-31 were rejected as being allegedly indefinite, however, the Examiner then only discussed claim 1 in this regard. In particular, the Examiner asserted that claim 1 is allegedly vague and indefinite on grounds that (i) the claim

recites a node sending an RTP sequence in which each RTP packet includes *a code that represents a source of real-time media but does not actually identify that source* and (ii) the claim later recites that the node includes in an RTP header of at least one packet of the sequence an actual identification of the source of the media. The Examiner asserted that this was vague because it was unclear to the Examiner how a node can both (i) send a code that represents but does not actually identify the media source and (ii) actually identify the media source in the RTP packet. Referring to the specification, the Examiner questioned whether Applicant meant that *another* node is the node that sends the actual identification.

Applicant submits there is no lack of clarity.

There is no problem with the recitation that a node sends a sequence of RTP packets each of which including a code that represents but does not actually identify the media source and at least one of which includes an actual identification of the media source. There is nothing illogical or unclear about including both of those pieces of information in a given packet. Further, it is not necessarily the case that one node sends the packet containing only the code and *another* node sends a packet containing the actual identification. A review of Applicant's specification as a whole makes this clear. See, for instance, the first paragraph of the Summary section and then other discussion throughout.

Because the claims are clear as written, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the § 112 rejection.

b.   **Response to § 103 Rejections**

Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the subject matter of claim 11 that the Examiner indicated would be allowable, and Applicant has cancelled claim 11 (and amended claims 12 and 13 to depend directly from claim 1). Thus, Applicant submits that claim 1 is now

9

allowable as indicated by the Examiner. Claims 2-10 and 12-14 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the reason that they depend from an allowable claim.

Applicant has amended claim 19 to include the subject matter of claim 22 that the Examiner indicated would be allowable, and Applicant has cancelled claim 22 (and amended claims 23 and 24 to depend directly from claim 19). Thus, Applicant submits that claim 19 is now allowable as indicated by the Examiner. Claims 20-21 and 23-25 depend from claim 19 and are allowable for at least the reason that they depend from an allowable claim.

By making each of the amendments noted above, Applicant does not acquiesce in any of the claim rejections. However, Applicant has made the claim amendments without prejudice in order to expedite prosecution.

As noted above, now pending in this application are claims 1-10, 12-14, 19-21, and 23-25, of which claims 1 and 19 are independent and the remainder are dependent. Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and Applicant thus respectfully requests notice to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

**MCDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP**

Date: November 26, 2007

By: /Lawrence H. Aaronson/
Lawrence H. Aaronson
Reg. No. 35,818

10